

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

DEREK L. SWEET, #223 669,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-11-WHA
)	[WO]
ANGIE BAGGETT, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Ventress Correctional Facility, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on January 5, 2018. Upon initiation of this action Plaintiff filed an application seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* before this court. Doc. No. 2. In support of this request, Plaintiff provided financial information necessary to determine the average monthly balance in his prison account for the 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of this complaint and the average monthly deposits to his inmate account during the past six months. *Id.*

After a thorough review of the financial information provided by Plaintiff and pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A), the court determined that Plaintiff owed an initial partial filing fee of \$11.83. Doc. 3. The court directed Plaintiff to pay the initial partial filing fee on or before January 31, 2018. *Id.* at 2. In addition, this order specifically informed Plaintiff “that it is his responsibility to submit the appropriate paperwork to the prison account clerk for transmission of his funds to this court for payment of the initial partial filing fee.” *Id.* The order also “advised [Plaintiff] that if he is unable to procure the initial partial filing fee within the time allowed by this court he must inform the court of such inability and request an extension of time within which to file the fee.” *Id.* at 3. Moreover, the court specifically cautioned Plaintiff that

failure to pay the requisite fee within the time allowed by the court would result in a Recommendation “that his case be dismissed and such dismissal will not be reconsidered unless exceptional circumstances exist.” *Id.*

On March 26, 2018, the court granted Plaintiff an extension to and including April 9, 2018, to comply with the January 10, 2018, order that he pay an initial partial filing fee. Doc. 6. When Plaintiff failed to pay the required fee within the time the allowed, the court entered an order on April 19, 2018, directing Plaintiff to show cause by May 1, 2018, why this case should not be dismissed for his failure to pay the initial partial filing fee as ordered by the court. Doc. 7.

Plaintiff has neither submitted the initial partial filing fee within the time allowed by the court nor has he responded to the April 19, 2018, order to show cause. The court, therefore, concludes this case is due to be dismissed. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (As a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.); *see also Tanner v. Neal*, 232 Fed. Appx. 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate's § 1983 action for failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with court's prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure to comply).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to pay the initial partial filing fee in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A) as ordered by this court.

It is further

ORDERED that **on or before June 22, 2018**, Plaintiff may file an objection to the Recommendation. Any objection filed must specifically identify the factual findings and legal

conclusions in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which Plaintiff objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court.

Failure to file a written objection to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall "waive the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done, on this the 8th day of June, 2018.

/s/ Susan Russ Walker
Susan Russ Walker
United States Magistrate Judge